DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 463 SO 000 200

AUTHOR Besel, Ronald R.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation Report: Project Insight. 1969-1970.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$2.80
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Tests, Caucasian Students, *Curriculum Development, *Curriculum Evaluation, Elementary School Teachers, *Human Relations Programs, Measurement Instruments, Negro Students, *Projects, Question Answer Interviews, Secondary School Students, Secondary School Teachers, Social Attitudes, *Social Studies, Student Attitudes, Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Project Insight

ABSTRACT

This report describes the measurable impact of the course, Human Relations, on student attitudes and a synthesis of views from extensive teacher interviews. (Technical aspects of the evaluation design, instrumentation, and tables are appended.) Experimental subjects were 811 students, grades 9-12, who were completing the semester course. 14 attitude scales were cast into three distinct forms: for blacks and whites; whites only; and, blacks only. The overall results indicate that the course has an effect on expressed verbal attitudes of students in accord with the general goals of the program, such as increased sensitivity and self-awareness. 26 high school teachers (representing 20 school systems) who use the curriculum were interviewed. Their subjective impressions were highly positive. Other teacher responses are also summarized. A "tentative and impressionistic" summary of elementary school teachers' responses is also provided. Finally, the authors discuss their concerns about the whole program. (DJB)

ED 045463

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION REPORT: PROJECT INSIGHT

1969-1970

Ronald R. Besel
Robert Knappenberger
Ruth Lees
T. Joseph Sheehan
Marvin Wasman

SP 000 200

Table of Contents

	Page
Prologue	1
Introduction	1
Impact of the Program on Student Attitudes	2
Summary of Secondary School Teacher Interviews	9
Summary of Elementary School Teacher Interviews	16
Classroom Observations	18
Areas of Concern	18
Appendix A	21
Appendix B	22
Appendix C	27
Appendix D	41
Appendix E	44

EVALUATION REPORT: PROJECT INSIGHT

Prologue

One goal of Project Insight was to increase sensitivity and self-awareness. It worked. As evaluators, we experienced increased self-awareness and sensitivity toward the evaluator's untenable role. If he is able to demonstrate that a project has been a grand success, the anticipated response from the project directors is: "Why, of course. Your're simply telling us the obvious and we could have told you the same thing more cheaply." If, however, he fails to show that the project is having the intended effects, he can expect another response, such as, "Those poor fellows never did understand what we were trying to do. Their design was poor and they are probably incompetent." If he stresses the positive, he will be accused of "buttering up" the project people. If he should mention areas in need of improvement, he is accused of being angry and hostile. He can't win.

Since this report is intended to be an honest and objective discussion of our findings, it is natural to expect that all of the above themes will be touched.

Introduction

In undertaking an evaluation of Project Insight, we have been confronted with a number of limitations. These included the following: (1) Absence of precise instructional objectives; (2) Absence of detailed

guidelines for teachers except for a general directive to utilize inductive teaching methods; (3) Difficulty in measuring changes in the affective domain--the few existing instruments were outdated and of doubtful validity for high school students; and, (4) Diversity of the target population--the program was conducted in schools which differed in the socio-economic, ethnic, and racial make-up of students.

This year, again, our strategy was two-pronged, using the formative-summative model of evaluation described in last year's report, with the formative data emphasizing what is actually going on from day to day and the summative data attempting to assess the impact of the program on the behavior and attitudes of students. The main differences in approach are tactical with extensive changes in the instruments and evaluation design. The report will first describe the measurable impact of the course on student attitudes and then a synthesis of views collected from extensive teacher interviews. Technical aspects of design, instrumentation, and tables will follow in appendices.

Impact of the Program on Student Attitudes

We found in our evaluation study of last year that certain broad general aims were shared by all the teachers: to increase the student's awareness of his own attitudes, values and ideals; to promote the growth of an empathic, tolerant individual especially with regard to other racial and religious groups; and to increase the student's knowledge of social problems in our community and our society. Unfortunately, it is apparent that no measures exist for assessing change in many of these

areas, either within or outside the classroom. Nor does the program have a theoretical framework which specifies the type of behavioral changes which would follow from the above goals. We felt that assessment of the effectiveness of the program required objective and quantifiable measures in which change could be predicted in a given direction on the basis of the curriculum goals. Utilizing these criteria we selected verbal attitudes with regard to racial problems, anti-Semitism, and attitudes toward the poor as our basic measures of the effectiveness of the program. These measuring instruments are obviously quite limited in scope. The program may well have an enormous impact on the student in many areas which were not included or even considered by this evaluation approach.

Our basic design focused on a comparison of those students who were finishing a one-semester Human Relations course with comparable groups who were about to begin.[1] It was hoped that any bias in the selection of control groups could thus be eliminated. The way in which the students were chosen to participate in the Human Relations curriculum varied from school to school, but within each of the schools tested, the selection method was comparable between semesters. Also, as nearly as possible classes were chosen at random within each school from those available. Thus, we believe that the control group was generally comparable except for participation in the Human Relations course.

---

[1]The study generally utilized the "Institutional Cycle Design" described in Campbell, Donald T. and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Utilizing this design, 811 students completing the Human Relations course and 849 students about to begin the curriculum were tested and compared. A detailed description of the sample will be found in Appendix A. These students attended the fourteen schools in the program in which the course was taught on a one-semester basis in both the spring and fall semesters by the same teacher. The sample included both inner city and suburban schools representing a wide range of geographical locations and socioeconomic conditions; classes were all white, all black, and integrated; both junior and senior highs were included; grade levels ranged from ninth to twelfth and included several levels of ability grouping. We have no reason to conclude that this sample is not representative of the entire population within the program. We did, however, measure the effects of the one-semester format only.

The instruments used to assess student attitudes were modified extensively from last year; a detailed technical description of their construction will be found in Appendix B. Briefly, some fourteen attitude scales were cast into three distinct forms. The titles of these scales and the form on which they appear are shown in Table 1. Complete scale definitions and the items constituting each scale are presented in Appendix C. Form A-6, which is in the first column was designed to be identical for both black and white students and to measure attitudes toward integration; acceptance or rejection of stereotypes toward Jews, toward Negroes, and toward poor people; feelings toward the concept of Black Power, as well as acceptance or rejection of militancy as an alternative to other vehicles for achieving civil rights. Finally, a scale termed flexibility designed to measure tolerance for ambiguity and capacity for changing or responding to new situations was included.

TABLE 1.--Summary of Scales Used on Three Forms of Attitude Measurement Instruments

A-6 Blacks and Whites	A-5 Whites Only	A-7 Blacks Only
*INTEGRATION	DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD NEGROES +	DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD WHITES -
*DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD JEWS	EASE IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH BLACKS +	EASE IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH WHITES +
POSITIVE-SOUNDING STEREOTYPES TOWARD NEGROES	MILITANCY +	MILITANCY +
*DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD POOR PEOPLE	HUMAN RIGHTS +	HUMAN RIGHTS +
*BLACK POWER	TOLERANCE +	TOLERANCE +
*MILITANCY	SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF BLACKS -	SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF WHITES +
*FLEXIBILITY		

*Indicates statistically significant differences favorable to the Human Relations Curriculum.

+Differences favoring the Human Relations Curriculum, but not at a statistically significant level.

-Differences favorable to the control students, but not at a statistically significant level.

In columns two and three of Table 1, the other two forms are listed. The A-5 form was administered to white students only, and the A-7 form was administered to black students only. These two forms are parallel with the scales on A-5 measuring attitudes of whites toward blacks, and the scales on A-7 measuring the attitudes of blacks toward whites. Specifically, these scales were designed to measure acceptance or rejection of racial stereotypes, ease or discomfort in interpersonal relationships and social acceptance of other racial groups, and acceptance of basic human rights in a society as compared with individual rights. As on the A-6 form, a scale dealing with acceptance or rejection of black militancy was included along with a scale termed tolerance which was designed to assess acceptance or rejection of persons with values, attitudes, and life styles differing from one's own.

The overall results indicate that the Human Relations curriculum has an effect on expressed verbal attitudes of students as measured by our instruments in accord with the general goals of the program. These results are summarized in Table 1 and reported in detail in Appendix D. The results with form A-6 clearly support the benefits from the curriculum. The results with A-5 and A-7 show trends mostly in the same direction and are supportive; however, we cannot draw definitive conclusions concerning the results obtained with these two forms.

Specifically, students who have participated in the program and have finished a one-semester course, as compared with a similar group who are about to begin, can be described as differing along the following dimensions:

the participating students have more positive attitudes toward integration of the races, tend to reject derogatory stereotypes about Jews and poor people, are less negative and anxious about black power and black militancy, and appear to be more flexible or less rigid in their response to new situations. These results are statistically significant in that it is highly unlikely that differences between the two groups could have occurred by chance alone (indicated by asterisk in Table 1).

In addition, there were mixed trends on the A-5 and A-7 forms (indicated by + and - signs in Table 1). Both black and white students in the program tended to value human rights more highly than the rights of the property owner (+), and expressed themselves as more at ease in interpersonal relationships with members of the other race (+). Black students in the program, however, tended to agree somewhat more with derogatory stereotype statements about whites (-). It should be emphasized that even though most of the differences measured by the A-5 and A-7 forms are in a direction favorable to the Human Relations curriculum, they do not allow us to draw firm conclusions.

Differences between the results obtained with the A-6 form and the A-5 and A-7 forms could be attributable to a variety of factors and we can only speculate as to their influence. The A-6 form may have contained scales which were more relevant to the program. These scales may also have been less variable and more homogenous in terms of item construction. The format and wording of the items specific to racial groups with A-5 and A-7, may also have contributed to this difference.

The question as to whether the program is working in similar fashion for both black and white students requires some detailed consideration. Our results do not allow us to conclusively state from a statistical standpoint that blacks responded to the program in terms of a measurable attitude change. Nor can we state on the other hand, that the program had no effect or a different effect on the black student since our analysis did not show significant differences in the pattern of change for blacks and whites. The blacks did show trends similar to whites on many of our scales but on both the A-6 and A-7 forms these changes were not always statistically significant. A contributing factor to these results with blacks could be the relatively small sample size which represents a statistical limitation in data analysis. In addition, the scales themselves may not have been appropriate for black students in terms of language or the testing atmosphere. The statements may have had different implications for the black students than intended by white researchers. Blacks themselves varied more in their attitudes among themselves and polarization with regard to some issues may have washed out the course effect. Another reason for this effect could be the high turnover of black students within the inner city schools so that relatively few students actually completed the program. In brief, the program does appear to have changed the verbal attitudes of the black student but our confidence in this effect is less than in the case of the white student.

A final note of caution should be added. These results are limited to verbal attitudes obtained by a teacher administered instrument. The program may have served to sensitize the student to the aims of the program and

changes may represent a desire for approval or giving "correct" answers rather than a real attitudinal change. On the other hand, the program may be successful in making some students more open and prone to express "negative" as well as "positive" answers thereby nullifying the effects on instruments such as an attitude scale. These results are also restricted to responses to verbal statements and we have no way of knowing how they relate to behavior outside of the classroom. Finally, we measured the effects of the program only in those schools in which it was taught on a one-semester basis. One would have to be cautious in making general statements which by implication include various other scheduling formats although our subjective impressions and those of the teachers suggest that the one-semester model is not critical to the outcome of the program.

Summary of Secondary School Teacher Interviews

Our formative evaluation approach this year focused on collecting teachers' views of the Human Relations (H.R.) program by means of a structured teacher interview. (See Appendix E for a copy of the interview.) The interview schedule was formed from an original interview document which had been pilot tested and revised several times.

A representative sample of twenty-six of the fifty-two secondary school teachers using the H.R. curriculum were interviewed by one of five interviewers.[2] All of the interviewers had training in the use of

---

[2]Two persons not official members of the evaluation team interviewed sixteen of twenty-one elementary teachers using a greatly revised interview schedule. A summary of their reports will be included later in this section.

the interview instrument. Exactly half of the thirty-six senior high and sixteen junior high school teachers were interviewed. Two of the eight junior high teachers and nine of the eighteen senior high teachers had taught for more than one year in the program. Seven teachers were from inner city schools and nineteen from schools in various suburban areas. The twenty-six teachers represented a total of twenty different school systems.

A summary of the composite findings of the teacher interviews will be presented. A full report of these results is available.

A. The H.R. Course within the School Curriculum

The H.R. program was taught as a separate course in slightly less than one-half of the schools. In the remaining schools it was included as a part of a larger curriculum area, usually a variation of history or social studies. The curriculum was taught as a required course in forty percent of the schools and as an elective elsewhere.

Many of the teachers suggested that the H.R. program should be offered to students at all age and ability levels, beginning in the elementary school. A few teachers did express strong beliefs that the program worked best with students of higher ability in the last years of high school.

B. General Emphases of the H.R. Program

As we see in Table 2, a few topics were given moderate or stronger emphasis and others were practically by-passed by the majority of teachers as they tailored their individual H.R. curriculum. Other topics stressed by at least two teachers included adolescent problems, communication and intergroup relations, ecology, alienation, commitment and involvement, and student protest.

TABLE 2

Percentage of Teachers Giving Specified Topics Indicated Degrees of Emphasis

Topics	Strong Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Some Emphasis	No Emphasis or only Passing Mention
PERSONAL AWARENESS AND SELF-ACCEPTANCE	65	15	4	16
BLACK-WHITE ISSUES AND RELATIONS	61	19	11	9
WAR AND PEACE	11	19	27	43
ANTI-SEMITISM	7	19	30	44
SCHOOL PROBLEMS	15	23	34	28
POVERTY	19	34	27	20
DRUGS	0	7	46	47
SEX	0	7	38	55

C. Subjective Impressions of the H.R. Program

The majority of teachers held very positive impressions about the H.R. program. They expressed the beliefs that the program overall had been very productive, the students had been quite responsive in class discussions, and they personally felt satisfied with the experience of teaching the curriculum.

There were a few exceptions to these general views. Several teachers expressed disappointment with the students' lack of responsiveness, explaining that they perhaps expected too much from their students. Three teachers admitted feeling quite dissatisfied personally because all of their goals were not met. Administrative and co-teacher resistance to the program was cited by others as a direct hindrance to the program's productivity.

D. Effect of Human Relations Teaching on the Teacher

The teaching of human relations appears to effect the teacher as much as, if not more than, those taught. The teachers believe that their involvement in the program has radically influenced them personally and altered their approach to teaching.

If we were to paint a composite picture of all these influences, we would see a flexible and empathetic teacher who is confident in his own ideas and approach using predominately inductive teaching methods which encourage discussion and student contribution. This teacher would emphasize the human element in the curriculum paying special attention to the views, needs, and criticisms of the students.

E. Building and Maintaining Group Awareness

This area elicited some of the most divergent views expressed throughout the entire interview. Half of the teachers indicated that they gave great emphasis to the use of group experiments for establishing group awareness. The other teachers said they made little or no use of such group awareness exercises. Most of the teachers in the latter group felt they were "not qualified to handle awareness exercises" and hesitated using "artificial type games."

F. Teacher Evaluation of the H.R. Course

A large majority of the teachers surveyed were expected by their school administrations to give letter or number grades for the H.R. course. A small minority were allowed to use a pass/fail or credit system. Most of the teachers based their students' grades on special projects, their level of class participation, or on the content of the course with which the curriculum had been combined. More than half of the teachers felt that the present grading system was an inadequate measure of student progress and should be changed to some variation of pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory. Some new assessment attempts including personal awareness writings, student evaluation of the curriculum, video-taping, individual interviews with students, and role playing were also tried by teachers.

G. School and Community Response to the H.R. Program

Within the school setting, the superintendents were generally thought to be accepting of the H.R. program. The remainder were seen as neutral to or not knowing about the course. The same views were held about the principals except several were experienced as being actively negative toward the program. Other teachers, however, were seen quite differently. About one-third of the teachers interviewed saw their colleagues as accepting the program quite well. The majority of the teachers saw other teachers as generally neutral to or antagonistic toward the H.R. course.

In the majority of school systems, the teachers saw the program was evoking little response from the community. There were exceptions in which a strongly positive or strongly negative response occurred.

H. Summer Training Program

Considered as a total group, the teachers found that the summer training program offered many positive experiences. The experienced teachers viewed their summer sessions as somewhat more valuable than those who were involved in last summer's program.

I. Saturday Workshops

On the average, about one-half of the teachers attended each of the Saturday workshops. A majority of them found the workshops to be in general quite valuable with the one most important asset being the opportunity to get together and talk with other teachers. A third of the teachers, however, had some pointed questions concerning the organization and general helpfulness of the workshops.

J. The H.R. Program: Its Strong and Weak Points and Some Suggestions for Change

In response to questions concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the H.R. program and even more so in answer to inquiries about areas needing change, the teachers offered a wide range of views. Only the three main points will be listed for each category.

<u>Strong Points of the H.R. Program</u>:

1. There is an increase in a student's self-awareness and his awareness of others' problems.
2. There is a relaxed and free classroom atmosphere which turns kids on.
3. Teachers have the freedom to experiment.

Weak Points of the H.R. Program:

1. Film distribution and faulty equipment are some of the mechanical problems.
2. Curriculum problems include insufficient teacher training, vagueness of the program's structure, lack of individual student projects, overemphasis on films and depressing film content.
3. Individual counseling for students is one of the supporting services needed by the program.

Suggestions for Change:

1. Provide teachers with additional curriculum and self-awareness training and more opportunities to share ideas with each other.
2. Further program development should explore the needs for more overall program structure and a revised curriculum for the inner city schools.
3. Make use of other media in addition to films.

K. Additional Help Sought from the PACE Association and the Program Evaluators

As in the previous topic, we shall list the three areas most frequently suggested.

What PACE Could Do:

1. Establish more contact with the teachers giving them individually more support and feedback as well as making possible more interaction among all of the teachers.

2. Train teachers in the program to recruit and train other teachers.
3. Work with school administrators and boards for more program support.

What Evaluators Could Do:

1. Establish more contact with teachers by visiting in classrooms and giving supportive-critical feedback.
2. Help teachers develop "in-house" evaluation of classroom process and student attitudes.
3. Provide more feedback to teacher concerning evaluation procedures and observations already completed.

We conclude that most teachers were generally very positive and enthusiastic about the H.R. program. At the same time, they were willing to be openly critical of its weaknesses and consider the need for constant program evaluation and revision.

Summary of Elementary School Teacher Interviews

Our efforts to evaluate the human relations curriculum at the elementary school level were limited to collecting reports of the program from participating teachers. Sixteen teachers, both inner city and suburban, were interviewed by two students using a modified version of the questionnaire utilized with secondary school teachers. Informal contacts between the evaluation group and the elementary school teachers also provided some information concerning the program at this level. Neither the interviews

nor other contacts were highly standardized and the data were not subjected to rigorous analysis. Therefore, the following results, while representative of the teacher's responses, should be regarded as tentative and impressionistic.

1. There was a general feeling that the program was of value. Children came to recognize their own feelings and the rights of others. They also became more involved in community problems, school issues, and learned about Negroes' contributions to society. These gains were especially evident in group discussion.

2. They felt that the program worked best integrated into other aspects of the curriculum rather than as a separate graded subject.

3. The teachers reported their own teaching techniques had changed in that they now encouraged discussion and were more sensitive to students' feelings.

4. Teaching materials appropriate for the elementary level were highly inadequate.

5. Teachers did not receive enough help either in constructing the program during the summer workshop or in setting up and carrying out the program during the year. The Saturday workshops, in general, were of little value to them since they were primarily directed toward secondary school teachers.

6. The evaluation group did not provide any external feedback as to how the program was going nor any assistance in teacher-initiated efforts at evaluation.

Classroom Observations

The results of classroom observations in large measure confirmed our findings of last year. Styles of teaching and the patterns of classroom interaction again varied widely: from teacher-dominated classrooms to student-dominated classrooms, from classes devoted to a narrative recital of movie plots to debate among students about social issues involving a good deal of personal feelings. Many times these issues were related to actual student involvement in immediate social and community problems. Often, the observers were impressed by the high degree of teacher and student enthusiasm as evidenced by very active discussion and student involvement. These discussions often focused on differences in attitude within the class itself.

Areas of Concern
Human Relations Curriculum 1970

1. The program has really not had an adequate tryout in the inner city schools and the question as to whether special methods, techniques, and curricula for the inner city child have to be developed remains unanswered. Some teachers in the inner city schools have reported that the program has not been firmly established at least in part because of the absence of support from middle and upper level administrators.

2. Based on classroom observations the program appears to be more effective in terms of the content and quality of discussion with regard to racial attitudes in integrated schools. In schools where black and white

students are together in the classroom, the discussion has an immediate firsthand impact on students which is otherwise lacking. Unfortunately, very few schools are integrated to any significant extent. Thus, the possibility of increased inter-school projects and contacts is an area to be explored.

3. The whole area of self-awareness remains vague. Teachers vary considerably in their emphasis and approach to this area. The use of group exercises and games in order to promote self-awareness should be further explored, techniques developed, and limits defined. Teachers are interested in using these techniques but feel inadequately trained and prepared to apply them in the classroom.

4. Teachers are aware of the need for other media and techniques in addition to films for initiating discussion. In some classrooms, film discussion appears to remain primarily focused on specific details concerning plot and characterization. A rigid film schedule may contribute to this orientation.

5. There is a significant need for having teachers continue to interact with each other and to discuss mutual problems. Identification with the "human relations group" is especially important because teachers often feel isolated from their usual sources of support.

6. Teacher initiated evaluation techniques need to be developed if the program is to become indigenous to the school. Grading of the program is a difficult question demanding the concern of teachers, students, and administrators.

7. Individual school systems may require further encouragement before they seriously adopt the program in terms of giving adequate financial and personnel support.

8. The elementary school program is still in a pilot stage and requires additional consideration of its methods and goals.

Appendix A

Summary of Sample Statistics: Distribution According to Race, Time of Testing, Grade, and Racial Makeup of Schools

Student Group	White Students		Black Students	
	Form A-5	Form A-6	Form A-6	Form A-7
Pretest	327	323	97	103
Posttest	325	318	82	85
Totals	652	641	179	188
Distribution by Grade Level				
12th Grade	382	376	88	91
11 & 12 Mixed	179	171	41	45
11th Grade	62	63	2	2
9th Grade	29	31	48	50
Distribution by Racial Makeup of Schools				
All White	571	563	3	7
All Black	2	3	151	154
Integrated*	79	75	25	27

*Classes in which only one student was white or only one was black were not considered to be integrated.

Appendix B

Technical Description of Scales

Forms A-5, A-6, and A-7 are the most recent versions of opinion survey forms used in the evaluation of Project Insight. The White and Black forms (C-7 and C-8) used at the end of the 1968-69 school year were revised for pilot testing during December, 1969 (Forms A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4). Items were selected for these pilot forms with the intent of sampling from fifteen distinct content areas. With each revision of the survey instrument, items have been revised, added and scale descriptions adjusted in an attempt to clarify the content domain of each scale. Items have then been eliminated so as to increase the homogeneity of the scales. In the final selection of items for the scales used in the evaluation design, the following formalized procedures were used.

A. Content Specification:

1. Brief descriptionsof each scale were written which stated what the scales were attempting to measure.
2. A number of people (judges) were given several of the scale descriptions and a stack of cards, each of which contained one item from one of the opinion survey forms. The judges were asked to classify each item as belonging on one of the scales, as described, or as belonging on none of them.
3. The pattern of responses was plotted and interpreted with the assistance of comments made by the judges.
4. The descriptions of the scales were revised.
5. For each content domain a pool of items (which had been consistently identified with the corresponding scale description) was constructed.

B. Homogeneity Maximization:

1. Coefficient α was chosen as an index of homogeneity.
2. Based on prior experience it was decided that all scales except the personality measures would be composed of six equally weighted items.

3. A length of twelve items was arbitrarily selected for the two personality scales.
4. Separate computations of α were made for two sub-populations of the total sample tested: (a) Black students, (b) ninth grade students. This was done since both of these groups were small compared to the total sample size; the total sample could conceivably have high α values while the α values for Black students, considered separately are much lower.
5. A max-min decision rule was used to select items from the content domains, to form six and twelve item scales.
6. If the choice of items to be eliminated was insensitive to the "maximize α" criterion, two additional criteria were applied in sequential order. (1) Items which were most frequently identified with the scale description were preferred over other items; (2) Items which "extended" the domain of content were preferred over redundant items.

The max-min decision rule will be illustrated with the following example. The content specification procedure identified seven items as belonging in the content domain of scale 3, "Positive Sounding Stereotypes of Negroes." These were items 15, 18, 20, 42, 44, 59, and 60 of from A-6. Table 1 contains the α values with each of the seven eliminated--the seven possible six item scales that can be selected from a pool of seven items.

TABLE 1.--Coefficient α for Six-Item Scales (Scale 3)

Item Eliminated	Total Sample N=435	Black Students N=83	9th Grade Students N=48
15	.77	.49	.77
18	.76	.55	.78
20	.75	.46	.75
42	.76	.47	.76
44	.78	.37	.77
59	.73	.46	.75
60	.74	.46	.76

If only the α values for the total group were considered, item 44 would be eliminated in selecting a six-item scale. The α value for Black students would be only .37 for this selection. The max-min rule dictates the elimination of that item which leads to the maximum value of the smallest α values. Eliminating item 18 satisfies this criterion; .55 is the smallest α value with this selection.

This procedure for forming scales led to the elimination of scales for two of the content areas. (Negro Inferiority on the A-5 form and Anti-White on the A-7 form.) In both cases the content specification procedure led to the conclusion that either the items did not form a distinct content domain or that we had failed to describe the domain adequately. The α values for scales formed from the items intended to define these content domains were also too low to justify scaling.

Table 2 contains the α values for each of the fourteen scales for the four groups of students considered in the evaluation design.

Table 3 contains the intercorrelation matrices for the scales on each of the three forms; for form A-6 computations were made separately for White and Black students.

A construct validity study for the scales on form A-6 has been done as a doctoral thesis.[3] A factor analysis of the items and a variation of the "known groups" methods was included in this study.

---

[3]Ronald R. Besel, "The Construct Validation of an Opinion Survey Instrument," unpublished doctoral dissertation. Case Western Reserve University, August, 1970.

TABLE 2.--Coefficient for the Population Samples of the Project Insight Evaluation Design

Scale	White Students		Black Students	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
1 INTEGRATION	.87	.82	.59	.72
2 DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES (JEWS)	.80	.79	.77	.72
3 POSITIVE SOUNDING STEREOTYPES (NEGROES)	.70	.74	.61	.64
4 DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES (POOR PEOPLE)	.78	.73	.64	.54
5 BLACK POWER	.77	.74	.63	.58
6 MILITANCY	.62	.62	.57	.57
7 FLEXIBILITY	.63	.64	.52	.58
8 TOLERANCE	.65	.68	.61	.72
9 EASE	.74	.76	.71	.71
10 SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE	.84	.88	.71	.80
11 HUMAN RIGHTS	.80	.84	.65	.73
12 DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES (NEGROES)	.76	.77	--	--
13 DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES (WHITES)	--	--	.72	.77
14 MILITANCY	.71	.68	.57	.54

TABLE 3.--Correlation Matrices

A-6 Whites

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 INTEGRATION	1.0						
2 DEROG. STEREO. (JEWS)	.281	1.0					
3 POS. SOUNDING STEREO.	-.151	.119	1.0				
4 DEROG. STEREO. (POOR)	.350	.366	-.024	1.0			
5 BLACK POWER	.361	.270	-.083	.406	1.0		
6 MILITANCY	.117	.054	-.104	.143	.316	1.0	
7 FLEXIBILITY	.322	.352	.069	.401	.408	.159	1.0

A-6 Blacks

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 INTEGRATION	1.0						
2 DEROG. STEREO. (JEWS)	.134	1.0					
3 POS. SOUNDING STEREO.	.054	.231	1.0				
4 DEROG. STEREO. (POOR)	.236	.307	-.045	1.0			
5 BLACK POWER	.265	.203	.025	.392	1.0		
6 MILITANCY	.088	.166	.052	.191	.356	1.0	
7 FLEXIBILITY	.178	.494	.199	.428	.343	.183	1.0

A-5

Scale	8	9	10	11	12	14	
8 TOLERANCE	1.0						
9 EASE	.238	1.0					
10 SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE	.246	.441	1.0				
11 HUMAN RIGHTS	.065	.265	.322	1.0			
12 DEROG. STEREO. (NEGROES)	.410	.415	.411	.320	1.0		
14 MILITANCY	.319	.138	.150	.066	.268	1.0	

A-7

Scale	8	9	10	11	13	14	
8 TOLERANCE	1.0						
9 EASE	-.038	1.0					
10 SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE	.066	.617	1.0				
11 HUMAN RIGHTS	-.063	-.034	.013	1.0			
13 DEROG. STEREO. (WHITES)	.327	.290	.383	.088	1.0		
14 MILITANCY	.385	-.260	-.142	.100	.017	1.0	

Appendix C

Form A-6

Scale 1

Integration: Measures feelings toward a policy of integration of blacks and whites in terms of overall benefits and problems.

3. School officials should not try placing black and white children in the same schools because of the danger of fights and other problems.

17. Integration of schools is beneficial to both white and black children alike.

24. It is a good idea to have separate schools for Negroes and whites.

30. Integration should not be attempted because of the turmoil it causes.

32. Integration is more trouble than it is worth.

38. Integration will result in greater understanding between Negroes and whites.

Scoring: Score low if integration is opposed. Score high if integration is seen as so beneficial that difficulties or problems should not delay or deter the implementation of an integration policy.
17, 38 Agree; 3, 24, 30, 32 Disagree

Interpretation: The scale does not measure whether the individual favors various social policies, such as open housing or bussing, which have been proposed as means of achieving integration.

Form A-6

Scale 2

Derogatory Stereotypes (Jews): Measures whether derogatory stereotypes of Jews are rejected.

16. Jews keep too much to themselves instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government.

33. There are a few exceptions, but in general, Jews are pretty much alike.

34. No matter how Americanized a Jew may be, there is always something strange about him.

45. A major fault of the Jews is their conceit and overbearing pride.

48. Jews are never contented, but always want the best jobs and the most money.

55. Jewish landlords don't care how run down their property gets, as long as they get the rent.

Scoring: Score high if derogatory stereotypes of jews are rejected. All items scored Disagree.

Interpretation: A high score is hypothesized to be caused by either of two factors (or both). 1) The person rejects all statements which he feels are unfavorable toward Jews. 2) The person rejects statements which are phrased as a stereotype.

Form A-6

Scale 3

Positive Sounding Stereotype (Negroes): Measures whether positive sounding stereotypes of Negroes are rejected.

15. In this day of rush and hurry, the black man has met his problems in a much calmer manner than the white man.

20. Suffering and trouble have made Negroes better able to withstand the stresses and strains of modern life than most whites.

42. I think that black people have a sense of dignity that you see in few white people.

44. Negroes have more sympathy for other minorities than most whites do.

59. I think that black people have a kind of quiet courage which few white people have.

60. What Negroes have suffered in the past has made them a more noble people than are whites.

Scoring: Score high if positive sounding stereotypes of Negroes are rejected.
All items scored Disagree.

Interpretation: A person may score high if he is either anti-Negro or if he detects the generalization and rejects it. A person attempting to appear favorable toward Negroes will score low.

Form A-6

Scale 4

Derogatory Stereotypes (Poor People): Measures whether derogatory stereotypes of poor people are rejected.

8. The poor are often looking for free handouts instead of doing something to better themselves.

10. Most welfare programs are giveaways to people who won't work.

21. Poor people really do not want a job because they are living comfortably on relief.

23. People who are poor are usually irresponsible.

52. Most people who live in slums would make a slum out of better housing if it were given to them.

58. People who are poor are generally lazy or not trying hard enough.

Scoring: Score high if derogatory stereotypes of poor people are rejected.
All items scored Disagree.

Interpretation: A high score is hypothesized to be caused by either of two factors (or both). 1) The person rejects all statements which he feels are unfavorable toward poor people. 2) The person rejects statements which are phrased as a stereotype.

Form A-6

Scale 5

Black Power: Measures feelings toward the concept "Black Power" in terms of whether the concept has a positive or negative meaning and whether it has had a constructive impact.

6. The Black Power movement has greatly harmed black-white relations.

7. For me, Black Power means "hate whites."

13. There is nothing good in the aims of the Black Panther Party.

26. Black Power is black racism.

29. Black Power is hurting the civil rights movement.

49. Black power means violence toward whites.

Scoring: A high score indicates a favorable attitude toward "Black Power." A low scorer has a negative reaction to any statement referring to Black Power or Black Power organizations.
All items scored Disagree.

Interpretation: A person may have a mid-range score on the scale if he feels that "Black Power" has a different meaning to different people--some meanings positive and some negative--but that it has had a negative impact since most whites accept the negative meanings of the concept.

Form A-6

Scale 6

Militancy: Measures the degree to which militant actions are accepted or advocated as possible alternatives to legal and peaceful methods.

12. When non-violent methods fail, stronger measures are justified.

31. Boycotts of white owned businesses by blacks do more harm than good.

35. It is good that the slogans and aims of Black Power are sometimes frightening.

36. Violence and riots never serve a useful purpose.

46. Black people should remain peaceful even when non-violent methods fail to gain them their rights.

51. Even if whites prevent blacks from getting power, they are never justified in taking it by force.

Scoring: A high scorer expresses impatience with the calm orderly approach to Civil Rights and other reforms and feels that stronger measures are justified. A low scorer rejects the possibility that violent methods are ever justified or effective.
12, 35 Agree; 31, 36, 46, 51 Disagree

Interpretation: Since four of the six items refer to militancy by blacks, an individual's score may depend, to an indeterminate extent, on his feelings toward black people.

Form A-6

Scale 7

Flexibility: A flexible individual can tolerate a high level of ambiguity, can resist viewing life in terms of absolutes such as positive-negative or good-bad, and is capable of changing or responding to new situations. An inflexible person likes things definite, neat and unambiguous; he may be described as rigid or self-righteous and may endorse extreme solutions to complex problems.

5. For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts.

9. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

11. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

14. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.

22. I can't stand to listen to a teacher who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes.

25. I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences.

28. Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps."

39. It is hard for me to sympathize with someone who is always doubting and unsure about things.

43. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut answer.

50. Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it.

53. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.

56. The police should attempt to wipe out the Black Panther Party.

Scoring: A flexible person will score high; an inflexible person will score low.

All items scored Disagree.

Forms A-5, A-7

Scale 8

Tolerance: The tolerant person is accepting of people whose life styles may differ from his. Life style includes values, opinions and behaviors. The tolerant individual may also be described as trusting, sympathetic, able to understand the shortcomings of others and empathize with them. The intolerant person is critical of others, impatient and prone to be vindictive and judgmental.

9. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

11. In the long run, it is best to pick friends whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

13.* There is nothing good in the aims of the Black Panther Party.

25. People who don't live up to the standards they set for themselves are not fit to be leaders.

28. I have no patience with a person who always refuses to admit he's wrong.

39. It is hard for me to sympathize with someone who is always doubting and unsure about things.

43. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

47. I just can't like a person who does things which I consider wrong.

50. I can't tolerate people who are hypocritical.

53. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

54. I can't trust a person until I know him well.

56. If I found out that one of my friends used drugs, I would lose my respect for him.

Scoring: A tolerant person will score high; an intolerant person will score low.
All items scored Disagree.

Forms A-5, A-7 (Different wording on A-7 indicated).

Scale 9

Ease: Measures whether the person feels he is "color-blind" in his personal feelings or if he is completely at ease in intimate relationships with members of the other race.

16. It makes no difference to me whether I'm a black person or a white person.

27. I probably would feel somewhat self-conscious dancing with a Negro (white).

33. I can easily imagine myself falling in love with and marrying a Negro (white).

34. I would not mind at all if most of my friends were Negroes (whites).

45. I would feel uncomfortable about going out with a Negro (white) date.

59. I'd just as soon live in a black (white) neighborhood as a white (black) one.

Scoring: Score high if completely at ease in intimate relationships with members of the other race.
16, 33, 34, 59 Agree; 27, 45 Disagree.

Interpretation: It is hypothesized that any individual scoring high on Scale 9 will score high on Scale 10 (Social Acceptance); any individual scoring low on Scale 10 should also score low on Scale 9. Scale 9 items deal with a closer degree of social distance than Scale 10 items. A person attempting to appear equalitarian should score high on this scale.

Forms A-5, A-7 (Different wording on A-7 indicated).

Scale 10

Social Acceptance: Measures willingness to accept persons of another race in personal or social associations.

15. I would rather not have Negro (white) guests to a party at my home with most of my white (Negro) friends.

18. If I were invited to be a guest of a mixed Negro and white group on a weekend trip, I would probably want to go.

20. I would accept an invitation to a New Year's Eve party given by a Negro (white) student in his (her) own home.

42. I am willing to have Negroes (whites) as close personal friends.

44. I would be willing to introduce Negro (white) visitors to friends and neighbors.

60. I have no objection to double-dating with a Negro (white) couple.

Scoring: Score high if willing to accept persons of the other race in personal or social associations.

Interpretation: See Scale 9 interpretation.

Forms A-5, A-7

Scale 11

Human Rights: Items on this scale force a choice between "human rights" and private or property rights. The person favoring "private rights" believes that the individual's right of free association or "freedom of choice" allows him as a businessman or property owner to discriminate against Negroes. Those favoring human rights believe that the right of each individual to equal and fair treatment takes precedence over property rights.

3. A hotel owner ought to have the right to decide for himself whether he is going to rent rooms to Negro guests.

17. Barbers and beauticians have the right to refuse service to anyone they please, even if it means refusing Negroes.

24. An employer should not be required to hire blacks if he doesn't want to.

32. Real estate agents should be required to show homes to Negro buyers regardless of the desires of home owners.

38. A person should not have the right to run a business in this country if he will not serve Negroes.

48. A landlord has the right to refuse to rent to all black tenants.

Scoring: Score high if "human rights" are favored over "private rights."
32, 38 Agree; 3, 17, 24, 48 Disagree.

Form A-5

Scale 12

Derogatory Stereotypes (Negroes): Measures whether derogatory stereotypes of Negroes are rejected.

7. Negroes imagine that they have been discriminated against on the basis of color even when they have been treated quite fairly.

26. Negroes spend money for big cars and television sets instead of spending it for better housing.

49. One big reason why racial prejudice is still so strong is that Negroes offend people by being so sensitive about racial matters.

29. One important reason why Negroes are discriminated against in housing is that they don't keep up the property.

41. Black people can hardly be expected to gain social equality until many more of them exert some effort to better themselves and live more decently.

8. Negroes would solve many of their social problems if so many of them were not irresponsible, lazy, and ignorant.

Scoring: Score high if derogatory stereotypes of Negroes are rejected.
All items scored Disagree.

Interpretation: A high score is hypothesized to be caused by either of two factors (or both). 1) The person rejects all statements he feels are unfavorable toward Negroes. 2) The person rejects statements which are phrased as a stereotype.

Form A-7

Scale 13

Derogatory Stereotypes (Whites): Measures whether derogatory stereotypes of whites are rejected.

6. White people are insensitive to the needs of poor people.

8. No matter how nicely they treat a black person, white people don't really mean it.

26. The whites have shown by their actions that they are naturally hypocritical.

29. White people are friendly to Negroes only when they want something out of them.

41. Whites are always looking for ways to cheat black people.

49. Whites look down on anyone who is not white.

Scoring: Score high if derogatory stereotypes of Whites are rejected.
All items scored Disagree.

Interpretation: A high score is hypothesized to be caused by either of two factors (or both). 1) The person rejects all statements he feels are unfavorable toward Whites. 2) The person rejects statements which are phrased as a stereotype.

Forms A-5, A-7

Scale 14

Militancy: Measures the degree to which militant actions are accepted or advocated as possible alternatives to legal and peaceful methods.

12. When non-violent methods fail, stronger measures are sometimes justified.

31. Boycotts of white owned businesses by blacks do more harm than good.

36. Violence and riots never serve a useful purpose.

46. Black people should remain peaceful even when non-violent methods fail to gain them their rights.

51. Even if whites prevent blacks from getting power, they are never justified in taking it by force.

57. When a group resorts to force they defeat their own purposes.

Scoring: A high scorer expresses impatience with the calm orderly approach to Civil Rights and other reforms and feels that stronger measures are justified. A low scorer rejects the possibility that violent methods are ever justified or effective.
12 Agree; 31, 36, 46, 51, 57 Disagree

Interpretation: Since three of the six items refer to militancy by blacks, an individual's score may depend, to an indeterminate extent, on his feelings toward black people. Note that this scale differs from scale 6 on form A-6 only in the wording of item 12 and the replacement of item 35 with item 57.

TABLE 1.--Summary Statistics for Form A-6. (Common for both Blacks and Whites.)

List of Scales	Differences	Univariate F	Probability <
INTEGRATION	+.32	6.41	.0116
DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD JEWS	+.22	6.38	.0118
POSITIVE-SOUNDING STEREOTYPES TOWARD NEGROES	-.07	.80	.3706
DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD POOR PEOPLE	+.57	30.72	.0001
BLACK POWER	+.22	2.82	.0937
MILITANCY	+.45	7.49	.0064
FLEXIBILITY	+.43	11.15	.0009

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 5.39,
df = 7 and 810, probability <.0001.

TABLE 2.--Summary Statistics for Form A-5. (Unique to white students.)

List of Scales	Differences	Univariate F	Probability <
DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD NEGROES	+.15	2.22	.1364
EASE IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH BLACKS	+.11	.20	.6586
MILITANCY	+.04	1.35	.2466
HUMAN RIGHTS	+.21	.41	.5223
TOLERANCE	+.20	1.14	.2870
SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF BLACKS	-.05	.02	.8809

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = .5640,
df = 6 and 621, probability < .7592.

TABLE 3.--Summary Statistics for Form A-7. (Unique to black students.)

List of Scales	Differences	Univariate F	Probability <
DEROGATORY STEREOTYPES TOWARD WHITES	-.43	1.34	.2488
EASE IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH WHITES	+.15	.15	.6992
MILITANCY	+.15	.59	.4430
HUMAN RIGHTS	+.28	1.28	.2599
TOLERANCE	+.47	2.09	.1499
SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF WHITES	+.15	.10	.7573

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 1.3997,
df = 6 and 173, probability < .2174.

TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

April, 1970

Teacher_____
School_____
Grade Level_____
Date_____
Interviewer_____

Directions:

In the first part of the interview you will be asked to respond in several different ways. For some questions you will merely check the appropriate answer. In addition, in others you will be asked to react to the question by circling a number some place along the line between the word pairs which best indicates the teachers answer. For example, suppose the teacher is asked, "What was the general response to the human relations curriculum from your school principal?"

Very Enthusiastic	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5	Very Unenthusiastic

If the teacher feels it was very enthusiastic indeed, you would circle the "1."

Very Enthusiastic	(1) : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5	Very Unenthusiastic

If the teacher feels it was very unenthusiastic indeed, you would circle the "5."

Very Enthusiastic	1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : (5)	Very Unenthusiastic

As the teacher feels less strongly that one of the word pairs expresses his answer, circle a number closer to the middle. Further brief notes unique to the teacher's answer may be placed in the margin.

The final seven questions of the interview are more open-ended and therefore a brief statement for each is sought.

1. What is the nature of the course in which the H.R. curriculum has been taught?

   (a) A separate H.R. course _____

   (b) Part of a larger curriculum, e.g.,

   History _____ English _____

   Black History _____ Sociology _____

   Social Studies _____ Other (specify) _____

2. The H.R. course is:

elective _____

required _____

What do you think about the course being taught under these conditions?

Best possible way 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Worst possible way

3. (a) What has been the major emphasis(es) of your course? (Mark with the following symbols:
XXX=strong emphasis
XX=moderate emphasis
X=some emphasis
O=no emphasis or only passing mention)

personal awareness and self acceptance _____

black-white issues and relations _____

war and peace _____

anti-Semitism _____

school problems _____

poverty _____

drugs _____

sex _____

other (specify) _____

(b) To what extent do your class discussions focus on problems and issues which exist within the black community? (Use same symbols as explained in (a) above.)

_____

4. Did you teach in last year's H.R. program?

Yes _____

No _____

If yes, what are your subjective impressions of last year's experiences. Consider this in terms of the over-all productiveness of the course, student responsiveness and your personal feelings.

"Over-all Impression"

Very Productive last year 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very Unproductive last year

"Student Response"

Very Responsive last year 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very Unresponsive last year

"Personal Feelings"

Very Satisfied last year 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very Dissatisfied last year

5. Did you teach in the H.R. program last semester?

Yes _____

No _____

If yes, was it a one semester course?

Yes _____

No _____

Whether your course was for one semester only or if it is continuing for the entire year, think back to the experiences of last semester. What are your subjective impressions of last semester's experiences. Consider this in the same terms as number 4, above.

"Over-all Impression"

Very Productive last semester 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very Unproductive last semester

"Student Response"

Very Responsive last semester 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very Unresponsive last semester

"Personal Feelings"

Very satisfied last semester 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very unsatisfied last semester

6. What are your subjective impressions of the H.R. program this semester? Consider this in the same terms as numbers 4 and 5, above.

"Over-all Impression"

Very Productive this semester 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very unproductive this semester

"Student Response"

Very Responsive this semester 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very Unresponsive this semester

"Personal Feelings"

Very Satisfied this semester 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very Dissatisfied this semester

7. What approaches have you found to be effective for involving passive students?

[a]Writing _____

[b]Using a camera _____

[c]Have them make visual presentations _____

[d]Involve in small groups _____

[e]Question directly concerning non-involvement _____

[f]Other (specify) _____

8. How much emphasis have you placed in your over-all program plans on building and maintaining group awareness and experiences through group exercises and experiments?

a)Very great emphasis 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very little emphasis

b)If used, please specify any particularly successful and/or unsuccessful exercises or experiments.

Successful ones:

Unsuccessful ones:

9. What kind of grading system is used for the H.R. course?

   (a) Pass-fail _____

   Credit _____

   Letter or number grade _____

   Other (specify) _____

   (b) What effect does this have on your handling of the course?

10. How have you attempted to evaluate the progress of the H.R. course?

   (a) Personal awareness writings _____

   (b) Questionning on film plots _____

   (c) Written assignments _____

   (d) Student evaluation of the curriculum _____

   (e) Evaluation through class discussion _____

   (f) Judging most appropriate action in response to set situation _____

   (g) Other (specify) _____

   _____

11. How has the H.R. program been accepted by the school superintendent, principal, and other teachers?

"Superintendent"

Very well accepted 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very negative toward

"Principal"

Very well accepted 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very negative toward

"Other Teachers"

Very well accepted 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very negative toward

12. What responses have occurred within the community to the H.R. program?

(a) Great response 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : No response

(b) If there has been some response, what has been the nature of the response? (If there has been more than one type of response indicate this by circling more than one number on the continuum).

Very well accepted 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very negative toward

(c) If possible, specify the particular kind of response. _____

_____

13. How many Saturday workshops have you attended? _____

(a) What is your general response to these workshops? Do they serve a valid function?

Very valid and helpful 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very invalid and non-helpful

(b) Which were the most valuable workshops?

[1]Introduction to Workshops _____

[2]Eliciting Student Response _____

[3]Films and Games (New Media by Ron H.) _____

[4]Media Making (Kodak) _____

[5]Communication Games (Len H.) _____

[6]Demonstration of Student and Teacher Produced and Created Materials _____

(c) Which were the least valuable workshops? (See above for workshop titles).

1 _____ 4 _____

2 _____ 5 _____

3 _____ 6 _____

14. In retrospect, did you find your summer training program valuable?

Very valuable 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very worthless

(a) What specifically did you find valuable?

[1]Training in group process _____

[2]Film review _____

[3]Discussion of course goals _____

[4]Presentation of different teaching styles _____

[5]Experiencing inductive learning _____

[6]Other (specify)_____

_____

(b) What meeds were not met?

[1]Learning about new teaching methods _____

[2]Insufficient experience in applying group exercises _____

[3]Viewing actual or simulated class discussions _____

[4]Film review for various age groups _____

[5]Course guide of creative activities _____

[6]Other (specify) _____

_____

15. How would you describe your role(s) in carrying out the H.R. program?

[1]Director or stage manager _____

[2]Facilitator _____

[3]Resource person _____

[4]Initiator _____

[5]Lecturer _____

[6]Other (specify) _____

16. In what ways has your involvement in the H.R. program influenced your approach to teaching in other classes?

17. As a result of having implemented the H.R. course, what changes have taken place within you and your thinking in areas other than teaching?

18. Is there an especially "good" age or grade level for which the H.R. program is particularly suited? In response to the program, have you found any significant track, age, grade level, or other differences?

19. What do you consider to be the strong points of the H.R. program? What are the weak ones?

    (a) Strong points--

    (b) Weak points--

20. What suggestions would you have for making changes in the H.R. program?

21. How could the PACE Association and/or the curriculum and program evaluators be of additional help to the teachers?

    (a) PACE

    (b) Evaluators

22. Do you have any additional comments not covered in this interview?

RATING OF INTERVIEW

(a) Very animated 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very dull

(b) Very productive 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very unproductive

21. How could the PACE Association and/or the curriculum and program evaluators be of additional help to the teachers?

    (a) PACE

    (b) Evaluators

22. Do you have any additional comments not covered in this interview?

RATING OF INTERVIEW

(a) Very animated 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very dull

(b) Very productive 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 Very unproductive